



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,207	10/19/2001	Sachin G. Deshpande	8371-0144	5056
73552	7590	03/17/2008	EXAMINER	
Stolowitz Ford Cowger LLP 621 SW Morrison St Suite 600 Portland, OR 97205			MILLS, DONALD L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2616		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/055,207	Applicant(s) DESHPANDE, SACHIN G.
	Examiner DONALD L. MILLS	Art Unit 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 23-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Submitted claims 23-26 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the claims are directed towards the reception of video image enhancement, while the original claims are directed towards the transmission of a video image.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 23-26 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-13 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Der Schaar et al. (US 6,836,512 B2), hereinafter referred to as Van, in view of Mishra (US 6,075,768).

Regarding claims 1, 13 and 17, Van discloses a spatial scalability for fine granular video encoding, which comprises:

Accepting, at an input of a data transmitter, video data that has been encoded into a base layer and an enhancement layer;

Transmitting the base layer in a single stream to the transmission channel;

Recording indicia of the transmission of the base layer;

Determining a bandwidth available to the data transmitter based on the recorded indicia of transmitting the base layer (Referring to Figure 1, system **100** receives video images from video source **2** and transmits encoded video images across variable bandwidth network **6**.

Encoder **110** is composed principally of a base layer encoder **8**, a hybrid temporal-SNR FGS video encoder **20** and video rate controller **18**. Base layer encoder **8** encodes received video images into a base layer data stream. The encoded base layer represents a level of encoding that is representative of a minimally acceptable video image and is guaranteed to be transmitted over network **6**. FGS layer encoder **20** encodes residual images generated between the input video images and base layer encoded images of the input video images into a video enhancement layer. The video enhancement layer is used to improve the quality of an image produced by the encoded base layer. Rate controller **18** determines the rate of transmission of the base layer and enhancement layer, and consequently the number of bits that can be transmitted, depending upon the available bandwidth and user preferences. User preferences can be input to controller **18** by user input **3**. See column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 17.)

Van does not disclose transmitting the enhancement layer if there is enough bandwidth available to the data transmitter to transmit the enhancement layer and then ceasing the transmitting the enhancement layer responsive to accepting, at an input of a data transmitter, data that has been encoded into a second base layer and a second enhancement layer.

Mishra teaches a fair bandwidth sharing for video traffic sources using distributed feedback control, which comprises adjusting the video image quality in a data packet network based upon the detected network load. The video encoding circuit adjusts the video quality by increasing the video quality when the network load is in the uncongested state and decreasing the video quality when the network load is in the congested state (Referring to Figure 1, see column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 15.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the fair bandwidth sharing of Mishra in the video encoding and transmission system of Van. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for efficient usage of network bandwidth and smooth degradation in image quality under overloaded conditions, as taught by Mishra (See column 1, lines 51-54.)

Regarding claims 3, 16, and 18-20, the primary reference further teaches *wherein determining if there is enough bandwidth available to the data transmitter to transmit the enhancement layer in addition to the base layer comprises measuring data traffic on the transmission channel to determine if enough bandwidth exists to transmit additional layers* (Referring to Figure 1, system **100** receives video images from video source **2** and transmits encoded video images across variable bandwidth network **6**. Encoder **110** is composed principally of a base layer encoder **8**, a hybrid temporal-SNR FGS video encoder **20** and video rate controller **18**. Base layer encoder **8** encodes received video images into a base layer data stream. FGS layer encoder **20** encodes residual images generated between the input video images and base layer encoded images of the input video images into a video enhancement layer.

Rate controller **18** determines the rate of transmission of the base layer and enhancement layer, and consequently the number of bits that can be transmitted, depending upon the available bandwidth and user preferences. User preferences can be input to controller **18** by user input **3**. See column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 17.)

Regarding claims 4-7 and 15 as explained in the rejection statement of claims 1 and 13, Van and Mishra teach all of the claim limitations of claims 1 and 13 (parent claims).

Van does not discloses wherein the data transmitter has a pre-set average target data rate, and wherein determining whether or not to transmit the enhancement layer in addition to the base layer already transmitted comprises determining whether an average bandwidth already used by the data transmitter over a last measuring period is below the pre-set average target data rate.

Mishra teaches a fair bandwidth sharing for video traffic sources using distributed feedback control, which comprises adjusting the video image quality in a data packet network based upon the detected network load. The video encoding circuit adjusts the video quality by increasing the video quality when the network load is in the uncongested state and decreasing the video quality when the network load is in the congested state (Referring to Figure 1, see column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 15.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the fair bandwidth sharing of Mishra in the video encoding and transmission system of Van. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for efficient usage of network bandwidth and smooth

degradation in image quality under overloaded conditions, as taught by Mishra (See column 1, lines 51-54.)

Regarding claims 8, 21 and 22 as explained in the rejection statement of claims 1 and 17, Van and Mishra teach all of the claim limitations of claims 1 and 17 (parent claims).

Van does not disclose determining if there is enough bandwidth available to the data transmitter to transmit data in addition to the base and enhancement layers already transmitted by the data transmitter; and transmitting the second enhancement layer if there is enough bandwidth available to transmit the second enhancement layer.

Mishra teaches a fair bandwidth sharing for video traffic sources using distributed feedback control, which comprises adjusting the video image quality in a data packet network based upon the detected network load. The video encoding circuit adjusts the video quality by increasing the video quality when the network load is in the uncongested state and decreasing the video quality when the network load is in the congested state (Referring to Figure 1, see column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 15.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the fair bandwidth sharing of Mishra in the video encoding and transmission system of Van. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for efficient usage of network bandwidth and smooth degradation in image quality under overloaded conditions, as taught by Mishra (See column 1, lines 51-54.)

Referring to claim 9, the primary reference further teaches *wherein transmitting the base layer on the transmission channel comprises transmitting the base layer connection between two*

or more computers (Referring to Figure 1, system **100** receives video images from video source **2** and transmits encoded video images across variable bandwidth network **6**. See column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 17.)

Referring to claim 10, the primary reference further teaches *wherein transmitting the base layer on the transmission channel comprises transmitting data from a media server to an image projector* (Referring to Figure 1, system **100** receives video images from video source **2** and transmits encoded video images across variable bandwidth network **6**. See column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 17.)

Referring to claim 11, the primary reference further teaches *wherein transmitting the base layer on the transmission channel comprises transmitting data from a media server to a decoding device* (Referring to Figure 1, system **100** receives video images from video source **2** and transmits encoded video images across variable bandwidth network **6**. See column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 17.)

Regarding claim 12 as explained in the rejection statement of claim 1, Van and Mishra teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1.

Van does not disclose *determining if there is enough bandwidth available to the data transmitter to transmit the enhancement layer in addition to the base layer already transmitted comprises calculating at least two average bandwidths used by the data transmitter, each of the average bandwidths calculated over different measuring periods.*

Mishra teaches a fair bandwidth sharing for video traffic sources using distributed feedback control, which comprises adjusting the video image quality in a data packet network based upon the detected network load. The video encoding circuit adjusts the video quality by

increasing the video quality when the network load is in the uncongested state and decreasing the video quality when the network load is in the congested state (Referring to Figure 1, see column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 15.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the fair bandwidth sharing of Mishra in the video encoding and transmission system of Van. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for efficient usage of network bandwidth and smooth degradation in image quality under overloaded conditions, as taught by Mishra (See column 1, lines 51-54.)

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-13 and 15-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based upon the amendments to the independent claims.

Regarding claims 23-26, the claims are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the claims are directed towards the reception of video image enhancement, while the original claims are directed towards the transmission of a video image. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 23-26 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DONALD L. MILLS whose telephone number is (571)272-3094. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on 571-272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Donald L Mills/
Examiner, Art Unit 2616
February 28, 2008

/Chi H Pham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616
3/3/08